

Errata Sheet on the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Bank Stabilization at Cockspur Island Lighthouse

Comments were received during the public comment period that warrants the preparation and distribution of an errata sheet on the above referenced Environmental Assessment. This sheet will become part of the project file. The comments and responses are as follows:

1. **Comment:** Thank you for including me in the mailing on the lighthouse preservation efforts. I am no authority on marine matters or construction. However, I was discussing the proposed project with a friend who has lived in Savannah his entire life, owns a boat business, and is very interested in historic preservation. His suggestion is to build a cofferdam around the lighthouse and fill it with small rocks about the size of a football. With the area stabilized, there could be a walkway, dock, or some other structure built to facilitate access.
 - a. **Response:** The suggestion above is similar to the proposed action, which includes placing riprap along the shoreline and filling portions of the interior of the island with fill material designed to recreate the historic 1860s landscape. As stated in the EA, the surface would be interspersed with suitably sized stones of Georgia (GA) Type 3 Riprap to mimic the historic Coast Guard riprap and saltmarsh cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora*) marsh plantings would be interspersed with re-established oysterbed areas. An oystershell path would extend from the boat landing around the inner perimeter of the riprap to facilitate future project inspections and maintenance. The fill material would also provide a safe walking surface for park visitors and opportunities for recreational boaters and kayakers to access the small island.
2. **Comment:** My concerns rest with the decision to leave part of the retaining wall open and open to the outgoing tide, as well as leaving the parcel of land once filled with rip rap, oysters & Spartina, approximately 1 to 1 1/2 feet below the hi tide level. I understand The Corps desire to restore and stabilize the land to the Historic nature it was, but we now have vessels whose wake could soon leave the land area in the same position it is in now. I know the Corps wants to do a good job and claim their work will last for a great number of years (50). Yet I am still concerned about the above stated issues and at the same time do not want to keep the Lighthouse in peril much longer.
 - a. **Response:** A site specific engineering design analysis was completed to stabilize the unnamed island with a unique revetment design and beach nourishment plan in order to preserve the lighthouse for future posterity. The detailed design analysis was approved by the USACE and calculated values such as wind stress factor, design wave height, and armor stone size to protect the lighthouse and the northeast shoreline of the island. The revetment wraps 180 degrees around the northeast corner of the island to absorb the highest wave energy. To maintain historical accuracy of the site, construction is only located where it is necessary, the revetment closely follows the shoreline of the island, and the revetment is partially underwater at high-tide. The revetment design was based on the Hudson equation and the weight of armor stone. The plan was designed to provide defense as sea levels rise; the crest height was set higher than today's average mid-tide conditions, and the crest height is sufficient at high tide to act as a breakwater for larger waves. Therefore, the detailed design analysis incorporates the concerns listed above.

3. **Comment:** NOAA Fisheries at the Southeast Regional Office commented on the EFH Assessment (Appendix D of the EA) regarding habitats that are identified as EFH by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and that will be affected by the project, specifically oyster beds as well as saltmarsh and intertidal flats. Additionally, NOAA Fisheries requested information regarding the stockpiling and re-use of the live oysters and dead shell that currently exist around the Cockspur Island lighthouse.
 - a. **Response:** The EFH Assessment was updated to address the questions and concerns of NOAA Fisheries and incorporated saving and reusing the live oysters and shell hash at the site. NOAA Fisheries reviewed and accepted the updated EFH Assessment, which completed EFH consultation with NOAA Fisheries. The updated EFH Assessment is attached to the FONSI.
4. **Comment:** Georgia Department of Natural Resources Historic Preservation Division wrote in a letter dated May 21, 2009 that the proposed project would have no adverse effect to historic properties and that Section 106 compliance for this project is complete.
 - a. **Response:** The GDNR letter was included in the Administrative Record and in Appendix C - Agency Correspondence of the EA.
5. **Comment:** NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) responded to NPS with a letter dated July 15, 2009 that concluded consultation responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act for species under NMFS' purview.
 - a. **Response:** The NOAA NMFS letter was included in the Administrative Record and in Appendix C - Agency Correspondence of the EA.